

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1-37.

Claims 38-41 are canceled herein in accordance with the election of claims for examination. The Applicants note that no new material is added as a result of the amendments presented herein. The Applicants respectfully request consideration of the above captioned patent application in light of the remarks presented herein.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-23 and 33-37 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(a/e) as allegedly being anticipated by Barnett et al. (US 6,223,144 “Barnett”). Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that Barnett does not anticipate or render obvious embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-23 and 33-37.

Applicants respectfully assert that Barnett does not teach or suggest the limitation of “selecting available configurations of said hardware resources of said microcontroller” as recited by Claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection improperly equates Barnett’s “selected hardware configuration” (col. 6 line 60) with the recited “configurations of said hardware resources of said microcontroller.”

Applicants respectfully assert that Barnett utilizes the term “selected hardware configuration” to refer to a selection of a particular microprocessor, e.g.,

“such as Intel’s 8051” (col. 6 lines 14-15). In contrast, Claim 1 recites “selecting available configurations” of one instant device - the recited “said microcontroller.” However, Barnett is silent as to selecting from among multiple available configurations of a single microcontroller.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the objections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

In addition, Barnett makes clear that such “selected hardware configuration” is specified at a very high level, for instance: “each microcontroller variant (target hardware) is preferably implemented as a DLL” (col. 6 lines 34-35) and “software testing tool 100 utilizes the specified hardware configuration to select the appropriate target hardware model DLL” (col. 6 lines 61-64). Thus, Barnett teaches choosing among microcontrollers, not choosing among possible configurations of a particular microcontroller.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the objections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Further with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Barnett does not teach or suggest “generating configuration information corresponding to said selected configuration” as recited by Claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that Barnett teaches pre-existing information describing a microprocessor in contrast to the recited “generating.” Clearly, Barnett does not teach generating information responsive to selecting a configuration.

For this still additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the objections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 2-10 depend from Independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims as they depend from an allowable base claim.

With respect to Claim 11, Applicants respectfully assert that Barnett does not teach or suggest, “configuring a microcontroller containing a plurality of dynamically configurable blocks” as recited by Claim 11. Applicants respectfully assert that Barnett is silent with respect to such a microcontroller. In contrast, Barnett’s teachings are based upon microcontrollers exemplified by Intel’s 8051, which are well known to lack the recited “dynamically configurable blocks.”

For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 11 overcomes the objections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Further with respect to Claim 11, Applicants respectfully assert that this claim overcomes the rejections of record for the rationales presented previously with respect to Claim 1. For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 11 overcomes the objections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 12-21 depend from Independent Claim 11. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims as they depend from an allowable base claim.

With respect to Independent Claims 22 and 30, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims overcome the rejections of record for the rationales presented previously with respect to Claim 1. For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 22 and 30 overcome the objections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Claims 23-29 and 30-37 are dependent upon independent Claims 22 and 30, respectively, and incorporate all the limitations therein. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 23-29 and 30-37 overcome the rejections of record as these claims depend from allowable base Claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these Claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Barnett et al. (US 6,223,144 “Barnett”) in view of Zizzo (US 6,578,174, “Zizzo”). Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that Barnett in view of Zizzo does not render obvious embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32.

Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 11, 22 and 30, respectively, and incorporate all the limitations therein. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32 overcome the rejections of record

as these claims depend from allowable base Claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these Claims.

Barnett teaches a “software testing tool” (Abstract), while Zizzo is directed to a “circuit design platform” (Abstract). Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references due to their differences do not suggest the cited combination.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Barnett in view of Zizzo is improper. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32 overcome the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Further, the Barnett reference is complete and does not seek improvement in the manner suggested in the rejection as a motivation for the combination in view of Zizzo. The rejection suggests that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Barnett in view of Zizzo “to implement the description of hardware resources with (XML) because (it could be) preferably used as a primary data interface between various components of the design platform.” However, Barnett teaches:

According to a feature of the present invention, shown in FIG. 1B, all features of the microcontroller software testing tool 100 can be made accessible by means of a data exchange protocol provided by the operating system, such as the object linking and embedding (OLE) interface provided by Windows NT and Windows 95.

The OLE interface permits data to be shared between applications and provides a programmatic interface that allows the microcontroller

software testing tool 100 and related peripherals to be (i) accessed over a local or wide area network; or to be (ii) controlled by third party programs or scripts, such as general purpose controlling programs 120. In this manner, the general purpose controlling programs 120 can load, run and interrogate the microcontroller software testing tool 100 and record results in a standard document. Typically, general-purpose controlling application program(s) 120, such as Microsoft Word or Excel, include a macro language that allows pre-recorded actions to function when required.

In addition, the OLE interface exposes programmatically all the features of the tool. Thus, existing general-purpose office application program(s) 120, such as Microsoft Word or Excel, can integrate the testing of software using the microcontroller software testing tool 100 into documents and permit solutions created using languages that support OLE, such as Basic, Visual Basic, C, C++, Java or Delphi. Furthermore, the OLE interface allows the microcontroller software testing tool 100 to be incorporated into networked, intranet or internet configurations supported by the operating system, such as Windows NT and Windows 95, allowing sharing of the microcontroller software testing tool 100 and peripheral resources to distributed users. (col. 5, lines 16-51)

As such, Barnett singly comprises the benefits that supposedly motivate the suggested combination. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Barnett in view of Zizzo is improper. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32 overcome the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Further still, for the rationale presented previously, there can be no motivation in the cited references for the suggested combination. For this further reason, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Barnett in view of Zizzo is improper. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32 overcome the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Barnett teaches away from Zizzo and from the rejection's suggested combination of Barnett in view of Zizzo by teaching the benefits and use of OLE. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Barnett in view of Zizzo is improper. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 3, 12, 24 and 32 overcome the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1-37. The Applicants respectfully request consideration of the above captioned patent application in light of the remarks presented herein.

Applicants have reviewed the following reference that was cited but not relied upon and do not find this reference to teach or suggest the present claimed invention: US 6,594,799.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 3/14/2005